Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAY 1 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. 74-1372

ANTHONY P. TRAVISONO, et al.,
PETITIONERS,

v.

ANTHONY SOUZA, et al.,
RESPONDENTS.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

JULIUS C. MICHAELSON
Attorney General
RONALD A. DWIGHT
Special Assistant Attorney General
250 Benefit Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
(401) 831-6850

Blanchard Press, Inc., Boston, Mass. — Law Printers

43 LW 2402

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Opinions Below	1
Constitutional Provisions	2
Jurisdiction	2
Statement of the Case	2
Issue Presented	3
Reasons for Granting the Writ:	
I. The Circuit Courts of Appeals Are Divided on the Question of Whether the Eleventh Amendment Prohibits the Award of Attorneys' Fees Against a State.	4
II. The Basic Issue Involved is Whether the Eleventh Amendment Is Limited by the Fourteenth and This Issue Can Only Be Decided Finally by a Decision of the United States Supreme Court.	4
Conclusion	5
Appendix A	6

Table of Citations

Cases

Avco Corporation v. *Aero Lodge*, 390 U.S. 557 (1968)	4
Brandenburger v. *Thompson*, 494 F.2d 885 (9th Cir. 1974)	4
Class v. *Norton*, (2d Cir. No. 74-1702) (October 10, 1974)	4
Curtis v. *Loether*, 415 U.S. 189 (1974)	5
Edelman v. *Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651 (1974)	5
Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908)	5
Gates v. *Collier*, 489 F.2d 298 (5th Cir. 1973)	4
Hoitt v. *Vitek*, 495 F.2d 219 (1st Cir. 1974)	3
Jordan v. *Gilligan*, 500 F.2d 701 (6th Cir. 1974)	4
Jordan v. *Fusari*, 496 F.2d 646 (2d Cir. 1974)	4

Page

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. *E.P.A.*, 484 F.2d 1331 (1st Cir. 1973) 3
Skehan v. *Board of Trustees*, 511 F.2d 31 (3d Cir. 1974) 4
Souza v. *Travisono*, 368 F. Supp. 959 (D.R.I. 1973), aff'd, 498 F.2d 1120 (1st Cir. 1974) 2, 3
Souza v. *Travisono* (unreported opinions on attorney fees) (D.R.I. No. 5261) (opinion dated July 8, 1974), *aff'd* (1st Cir. No. 74-1243) (opinion dated March 11, 1975) (see Appendix "A") 4, 5
Stolberg v. *Members of the Board of Trustees for State College of Connecticut*, 474 F.2d 485 (2d Cir. 1973) 4

Constitutional Provisions

United States Constitution,
Amendment XI 2, 3, 4, 5
Amendment XIV 2, 3, 4, 5

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 2
42 U.S.C. § 1983 3

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No.

ANTHONY P. TRAVISONO, et al.,
PETITIONERS,

v.

ANTHONY SOUZA, et al.,
RESPONDENTS.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

The petitioners, Anthony P. Travisono, et al., respectfully pray that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment and opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit entered in this case on March 11, 1975.

Opinions Below

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals handed down on March 11, 1975 which is at issue here has not yet been reported and is set out in Appendix "A"

hereto. The lower court's opinion on the merits is reported at 368 F. Supp. 959 (D.R.I. 1973), and the affirmance of the Circuit Court at 498 F.2d 1120 (1st Cir. 1974).

Constitutional Provisions

United States Constitution, Articles of Amendment 11 and 14.

Jurisdiction

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was entered on March 11, 1975 and appears as Appendix "A" hereto. We invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

Statement of the Case

The case began in June 1972 when a newly appointed warden at the Rhode Island Adult Correctional Institutions (ACI) barred law students assisting attorneys of the Inmate Legal Assistance Program (ILAP) from the prison. In addition, the ILAP was ousted from its institutional office space, and the access of attorneys to the prison was curtailed. On July 27, 1973, the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island issued a preliminary injunction granting the right of any attorney to consult with an inmate at the ACI during business hours, ordered a room for attorney consultations to be constructed within 2 weeks, and reserved decision on the question of law student paralegals access to the prison.

On December 18, 1973, the District Court handed down a decision (368 F. Supp. 959 (D.R.I. 1973)) holding that inmates had a constitutional right to "qualitatively competent legal assistance, reasonably available and capable

of responding to the needs of the prison population." The Court found the use of law students by the ILAP was essential for the satisfaction of those rights and that the State of Rhode Island could not summarily bar law students from the prison. The right of an attorney to meet with his inmate client "of necessity filters down to his paralegal assistants." 368 F. Supp. at 970. On appeal, the First Circuit affirmed 498 F.2d 1120 (1st Cir. 1974).

Attorneys for the Plaintiffs subsequently applied to the District Court for costs including attorneys fees. On the basis of First Circuit opinions touching on that question *viz., Hoitt* v. *Vitek,* 495 F.2d 219 (1st Cir. 1974) and *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.* v. *E.P.A.,* 484 F.2d 1331 (1st Cir. 1973), the District Court awarded full attorney fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 at the rate of $60 per hour. (D.R.I. No. 5261) (opinion dated July 8, 1974). Over $15,156 in attorneys fees was involved. On Appeal, the First Circuit considered both "the difficult question of whether attorneys' fees awards against a state are barred by the eleventh amendment" and whether the award, if constitutional, was excessive. Appendix A at 7, 8. The Circuit Court considered the recent decisions holding both ways, but decided that an attack on constitutional grounds was foreclosed by its own recent decisions. Appendix A at 7. In addition, the Court limited the attorneys' fees to a rate of $30 per hour in court and $20 per hour out of court.

Issue Presented

Does the Eleventh Amendment prohibit the award of attorneys' fees as costs against a state or its employees in their official capacities in litigation to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment?

Reasons for Granting the Writ

I. The Circuit Courts of Appeals Are Divided on the Question of Whether the Eleventh Amendment Prohibits the Award of Attorneys' Fees Against a State.

The Third and Sixth Circuits have ruled that the Eleventh Amendment forbids an award of attorneys' fees against a state in order to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment. *Skehan* v. *Board of Trustees*, 501 F.2d 31, 42 (3d Cir. 1974); *Jordan* v. *Gilligan*, 500 F.2d 701 (6th Cir. 1974). The First, Second, Fifth, and Ninth Circuits have held to the contrary. *Souza* v. *Travisono*, infra, Appendix "A" (1st Cir. 1975); *Class* v. *Norton*, No. 74-1702 (2d Cir. October 10, 1974); *Jordan* v. *Fusari*, 496 F.2d 646 (2d Cir. 1974); see also, *Stolberg* v. *Members of the Board of Trustees for State College of Connecticut*, 474 F.2d 485 (2d Cir. 1973); *Gates* v. *Collier*, 489 F.2d 298 (5th Cir. 1973), rehearing en banc granted, 500 F.2d 1382 (1974); *Brandenburger* v. *Thompson*, 494 F.2d 885 (9th Cir. 1974). This conflict of the Circuit Courts of Appeal on this important Constitutional question supports the establishment of a uniform rule. See *Avco Corporation* v. *Aero Lodge*, 390 U.S. 557, 559 (1968).

II. The Basic Issue Involved Is Whether the Eleventh Amendment Is Limited by the Fourteenth and This Issue Can Only Be Decided Finally by a Decision of the United States Supreme Court.

The split in the decisions of the Circuit Courts of Appeals is a result of uncertainty over whether the language of the Fourteenth Amendment is a limitation on the immunities guaranteed by the earlier Eleventh Amendment. This issue of the relationship between the Eleventh and

Fourteenth Amendments was expressly left open in *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123, 150 (1908); cf. *Edelman* v. *Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651, 694 n.2 (1974); cf. *Curtis* v. *Loether*, 415 U.S. 189, 198 n. 15 (1974). A resolution of the issue posed by this case requires a determination of this fundamental question. Petitioner here asserts that an award of approximately $7000 is not an ancillary matter, especially since the award in this case which involved few lawyers is small compared to the future liability opened by the First Circuit's ruling in *Souza* v. *Travisono, supra*. This case squarely poses the issue of whether the proscription of the Eleventh Amendment is limited by the Fourteenth.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, your petitioner prays that this Honorable Court grant a Writ of Certiorari directed to the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and that this Honorable Court establish a briefing schedule towards the ultimate determination of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Julius C. Michaelson
Attorney General
Ronald A. Dwight
Special Assistant Attorney General
250 Benefit Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
(401) 831-6850

APPENDIX A

United States Court of Appeals
For the First Circuit

No. 74-1243

ANTHONY SOUZA, et al.,
PLAINTIFFS, APPELLEES,
v.
ANTHONY P. TRAVISONO, et al.,
DEFENDANTS, APPELLANTS.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

Before COFFIN, *Chief Judge*,
McENTEE and CAMPBELL, *Circuit Judges*.

W. Slater Allen, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, with whom *Richard J. Israel*, Attorney General, was on brief, for appellants.
Ralph J. Gonnella, with whom *Hodosh, Spinella, Hodosh & Angelone* was on brief, for appellees.

March 11, 1975

CAMPBELL, *Circuit Judge*. In *Souza* v. *Travisono*, 368 F. Supp. 959 (D.R.I. 1973), the district court held that in refusing to let law students render legal aid to inmates at the Rhode Island Adult Correctional Institutions (ACI), the warden deprived inmates of a constitutional right of meaningful access to the courts and also of a more general right to legal assistance with personal matters. Thereafter, the Supreme Court in *Procunier* v. *Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396, 419 (1974), held that prisoners have a due process right of access to courts, including reasonable access to law student agents of attorneys, "to challenge unlawful convictions and

to seek redress for violations of their constitutional rights." We then affirmed the district court decision in *Souza* to the extent it was governed by *Procunier*, but left unanswered whether inmate access to law students must be granted for more mundane problems.[1] 498 F.2d 1120 (1st Cir. 1974). On petition for recovery of costs and attorney's fees, the district court granted fixed costs of $464.85 to plaintiff inmates and attorneys' fees of $11,340.00, $2,040.00, and $1,776.00 to plaintiffs' three private counsel. Defendant state officials appeal from that part of the order allowing fees.

This case raises the difficult question of whether attorneys' fees awards against a state are barred by the eleventh amendment. There is also a serious question, should the award be constitutional, whether it is excessive. But first we turn briefly to appellants' general challenge to the court's authority to make any award of attorneys fees in a case like this one. We hold that line of attack to be clearly foreclosed by recent decisions of this circuit. *Hoitt* v. *Vitek*, 495 F.2d 219 (1st Cir. 1974); *see Knight* v. *Auciello*, 453 F.2d 852 (1st Cir. 1972); *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.* v. *EPA*, 484 F.2d 1331, 1333 (1st Cir. 1973).

As a predicate to its award the district court found that the litigation benefited the plaintiff class and that it furthered the significant public policy reflected in 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court expressed the view that the protection of inmates' constitutional rights depended on the efforts of skilled attorneys who "should be encouraged to undertake such difficult and time consuming litigation." We upheld this "public benefit — private attorney general" rationale in *Hoitt*.

We can see no factual basis for distinguishing this case

[1] This court considered the record inadequate for deciding this further question and noted that controversy might not exist because, among other things, there was no showing that a new group assuming the inmate legal assistance function needed or used law student assistants. 498 F.2d at 1124.

from *Hoitt*. It is immaterial whether appellants were, as they assert, in sincere doubt as to constitutional requirements prior to *Procunier*. The theory behind awarding attorneys' fees in this instance was not to punish appellants for bad faith but to recompense those who by helping protect basic rights were thought to have served the public interest.

Nor do we see merit in the argument that the attorneys' services were valueless because the Supreme Court's decision in *Procunier* would have resolved matters in any event. The need for the attorneys' services is not to be judged in hindsight but as it reasonably appeared at the time. *Procunier* vindicated, in important ways, the merits of the inmates' original position, and their attorneys earlier prevailed in the district court. Having forced the inmates to sue in order to establish their rights, it does not lie in appellants' mouths to disparage their having done so.

Thus, apart from the question of the eleventh amendment, which we did not consider in *Hoitt*, we find no error in the district court's discretionary ruling to grant attorney's fees in this case.

We turn next to whether taxation of attorneys' fees against defendant state officials is an award of money against an unconsenting state in violation of the eleventh amendment. The instant litigation was brought by Rhode Island inmates against Rhode Island officials. Notwithstanding its language,[2] the eleventh amendment has been held also to embody a notion of sovereign immunity restricting federal judicial power over litigation against a state by its own citizens as well as by citizens of other states. *E.g., Edelman* v. *Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651, 662-63 (1974);

[2] The eleventh amendment provides:
"The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State."

Employees of the Dep't v. *Department of Pub. Health & Welfare*, 411 U.S. 279 (1973); *Duhne* v. *New Jersey*, 251 U.S. 311 (1920); *Hans* v. *Louisiana*, 134 U.S. 1, 10-15 (1890).

It was held in *Edelman* that a citizen may not recover "an accrued monetary" liability from a state. 415 U.S. 664. A remedy in the form of a recovery of money was distinguished from an injunction or declaratory judgment. These latter "prospective" remedies are not barred by the eleventh amendment even though they may have the "ancillary effect" of a drain upon the state treasury. 415 U.S. at 666 n. 11, 668; *see Ford Motor Co.* v. *Dept. of Treasury*, 323 U.S. 459 (1945); *Ex parte New York*, 256 U.S. 490, 500 (1921); *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123, 159-60 (1908).

Viewed in isolation, an award of attorneys' fees in the present case might seem akin to a money judgment against Rhode Island. Since defendant officials were sued for acts done apparently in good faith and within their official authority, they will doubtless be reimbursed by the state for the award. *Cf. Edelman, supra* at 664-68. Thus arguably the fees are an unconstitutional exaction upon Rhode Island. On the other hand, the fees are incidental to the main litigation, which, being for injunctive and declaratory relief, was permissible under the eleventh amendment. An award of attorneys' fees is perhaps so "ancillary" as to be constitutional, even though there will be some drain on the state treasury. Which view is correct is presently unclear. *Compare, e.g., Skehan* v. *Board of Trustees*, 501 F.2d 31 (3d Cir. 1974), *and Jordan* v. *Gilligan*, 500 F.2d 701 (6th Cir. 1974), *with Class* v. *Norton*, No. 74-1702 (2d Cir. Oct. 10, 1974), *Gates* v. *Collier*, 489 F.2d 298 (5th Cir. 1973), *petition for rehearing en banc granted*, 500 F.2d 1382 (5th Cir. 1974), *and Sims* v. *Amos*, 340 F. Supp. 691 M.D. Ala. 1972), *aff'd mem.*, 409 U.S. 942 (1973).

The Rubicon was seemingly crossed in this circuit in

Boston Chapter NAACP, Inc. v. *Beecher*, 504 F.2d 1017 (1st Cir. 1974), where we approved the assessment of the costs of an appeal in a civil rights action against Massachusetts officials. We relied upon *Fairmount Creamery Co.* v. *Minnesota*, 275 U.S. 70 (1928), in which the Supreme Court declared that sovereign immunity did not protect a state against judgment for costs in litigation before the Supreme Court. The Court viewed the costs as incident to its regular jurisdiction, the awarding of costs being "the invariable practice". *Id.* at 77.

If, as we held in *Boston Chapter NAACP*, the eleventh amendment allows costs to be assessed against state officials, it is hard to see why it should bar attorneys' fees. Both are in similar relationship to the main litigation and both should stand or fall together. It is true that there is less sanction in our law for attorneys' fees; and the awarding of fees in these precise circumstances and upon the rationale we approved in *Hoitt* has yet to be considered by the Supreme Court. Conceivably costs, being more traditional than attorneys' fees, are allowable, but attorneys' fees are not. Conceivably attorneys' fees based on certain rationales are allowable but others are not. Nonetheless, whatever the situations ultimately deemed suitable for the award of the attorneys' fees, such fees, to the extent allowable, seem to us generically to be the same as court costs. They are a part of the litigation expense deemed, for whatever reason, recoverable by the successful party or attorney. Any effort to distinguish for eleventh amendment purposes on the basis of theories of award would invite endless confusion. And to the extent states and state officials are, under our federal system, amenable to suit in federal courts, they should be responsible for costs and fees incidental to litigation to the same degree as others. To that extent, as the Supreme Court said in *Fairmont*, a state may lose "some of its sovereign character". 275 U.S. at 77. Accordingly,

for reasons set forth in *Boston Chapter NAACP*, we hold that attorneys' fees, like costs, are not barred by the eleventh amendment.

Appellants argue that the amount of attorneys' fees awarded was excessive. Without belittling the value of the services, we agree. The district court awarded fees at the rate of $60 per hour, based on affidavits of two prominent local attorneys citing returns of $60 and $70 per hour as reasonable. Noting that the specific amount to be awarded was within the courts discretion, the court listed as relevant factors "the circumstances surrounding the case, its importance and complexity, and the skill, experience and professional standards of the attorney." The court found plaintiffs' attorneys to be "skilled, well prepared and obviously experienced in prison litigation"; their work was of "high caliber" and of "unquestioned assistance" to the court. Appellants have not contested the hours spent by plaintiffs' counsel, but argue that a skilled and experienced counsel able to charge $60 per hour in the marketplace would not have required so many hours to prepare and conduct this case.

We disagree with the assumption of the district court and both parties that the hourly rate is to be based on the reasonable marketplace rate for such services. This is not a case in which the attorneys sold their services to a pirvate client willing to pay the market price for them. *Cf. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.* v. *EPA, supra*, 484 F.2d at 1338-39.[3] Those who will ultimately pay the fees, the Rhode

---

[3] We said in that case, in reference to the issue of attorneys' fees to be imposed upon an agency of the federal government,

> "We will scrutinize carefully the requested costs and fees. Petitioners are not a public agency and are legally responsible to no one but themselves; we must satisfy ourselves that the taxpayer's money will not be used to support needless or excessive legal items. We must also recognize that petitioners, as surrogate attorneys for the interest of the public and the EPA, have volunteered and 'imposed' their services on 'clients' that

Island taxpayers — on a theory, in part, of public benefit — have had no opportunity to pass on either the extent of the services or on the fees.

Judge Theis of the District of Kansas, dealing also with an award of fees in civil rights litigation, put the matter in what we hold to be proper perspective:

> "In determining the amount of an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, the Court is mindful that the award is designed to effectuate public policy, encourage private litigation, and spread litigation expenses equitably among those benefiting from the institution of the action—not to punish the wrongdoer or to reward the successful plaintiffs or their attorneys. A member of the legal profession has the obligation to represent clients who are unable to pay for counsel and also to bring suits in the public interest. While embarking upon their duties, they should not be motivated by a desire for profit but by public spirit and sense of duty."

Gilpin v. *Kansas State High School Activities Ass'n, Inc.*, 377 F. Supp. 1233, 1253 (D. Kan. 1974).

Here we have the further aspect that the litigation was only partially successful. While, as we have noted, the attorneys are not to be denied reasonable fees merely because *Procunier* settled favorably one of the main questions, it is appropriate, in establishing a reasonable fee, to take into account the net result of their efforts.

We conclude, as did Judge Theis and as did Chief Judge Johnson in *Wyatt* v. *Stickney*,[4] that the Criminal Justice Act is a reasonable point of reference in establishing a fee. We recognize that inflation tends to render the fee schedule under the Act less adequate than formerly; on the other

never contracted for them. As attorneys for involuntary clients, their fees may properly be less than those they could have received by entering the marketplace and selling their services to the private client who would make the highest bid for them."

[4] 344 F. Supp. 387 (N.D. Ala. 1972).

hand, it has yet to be modified legislatively, and it provides a benchmark. The alternative — leaving the matter to the total discretion of each judge — invites a wide disparity of fees and, we would suspect, the sort of public cynicism which can only undermine the ideals which the main litigation sought to promote. We add, however, that while the Criminal Justice Act rate of $30 per in-court hour and $20 per out-of-court hour should be the usual guideline in cases of this nature, we might sanction departures therefrom in cases of truly exceptional public importance. Moreover, should inflation continue to take its toll, we will keep an open mind to some general upward revision in the generality of cases.

We accordingly reverse the order of the district court as to the amount of attorneys' fees,[5] and remand for redetermination of the fees on the basis of a rate of $30 per in-court hour and $20 per out-of-court hour.

So ordered.

[5] We do not disturb the grant of $464.85 for fixed costs.

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAY 9 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. 74-1372

ANTHONY P. TRAVISONO, et al.,
PETITIONERS,

v.

ANTHONY SOUZA, et al.,
RESPONDENTS.

SEPARATE APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

JULIUS C. MICHAELSON
Attorney General
RONALD A. DWIGHT
Special Assistant Attorney General
250 Benefit Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
(401) 831-6850

Blanchard Press, Inc., Boston, Mass. — Law Printers

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

Civil Action No. 5261
ANTHONY SOUZA, et al.
v.
ANTHONY TRAVISONO, et al.

OPINION

PETTINE, *Chief Judge.*

This is a civil action filed on behalf of the inmates confined at the Adult Correctional Institutions (hereinafter "ACI") against various state officials and correctional officers seeking declaratory and injunctive relief. Specifically, the plaintiffs allege that they had been denied the right of access to counsel and the right to attorney-client confidential communication in violation of First, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The cause of action arose under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. Jurisdiction is based upon 28 U.S.C. § 1343. Counsel for the plaintiffs now petition the Court for costs and attorneys fees.

Travel of the Case

In November 1971, an Inmate Legal Assistance Program (hereinafter "ILAP") was instituted at the Adult Correctional Institutions under the auspices of the Rhode Island Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration and was administered pursuant to a sub-contract by the Center for Corrections and the Law at Boston College Law School. The program was federally funded and is designed to provide a full panoply of legal services to indigent prisoners. At the time the suit was commended "ILAP" was staffed by a supervising attorney, a staff attorney, an office manager, and a group of law students from the Boston College Law School who

work on a part-time basis assisting the two staff attorneys. On April 2, 1973 a riot occurred at the prison and shortly thereafter, on June 22, 1973, a guard was murdered. In the interim a new warden was appointed and as a result of his policies, the "ILAP" was evicted from its institutional office space, law students were barred from the prison, and the access of attorneys to the prison was curtailed.

On July 27, 1973, this Court issued a preliminary injunction with the consent of all parties after a hearing at which evidence was presented. In substance, the Order granted any attorney the right to consult with an inmate at the "ACI" once he designated the general purpose of his visit. The Order further provided that consultation could reasonably be had between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. with consultations permitted at other times for reasonable cause. Regarding agents and/or experts of attorneys the warden was ordered to make individualized determinations whether they were to be admitted until the Court decided the broader issue of law student access to the prison. The Court also ordered the room being constructed for attorney consultations be completed within two weeks. In the July 27, 1973 decision, this Court expressly reserved decision on the following issues:

(a) whether or not agents or experts in the service of attorneys enjoy the same privilege as attorneys;

(b) whether or not the consultation facilities afford appropriate confidentiality;

(c) whether the room to be provided to attorneys would be adequate for appropriate consultation by the attorney and client;

(d) whether or not the "ILAP" is entitled to the use of an office in the administration section of the maximum security building.

On December 18, 1973[1] this Court in its decision on the reserved issues held that an inmate has a constitutional right to reasonable access to the courts and that for that right to have any meaning inmates must also have the right to access to "qualitatively competent legal assistance, reasonably available and capable of responding to the needs for the prison population." In the instant action the Court found that the use of law students by the "ILAP" was essential for the satisfaction of those rights and held that the state could not condition operation of the program so as to effectively impair these constitutional rights by summarily barring law students from the prison. Additionally, the Court held, "In circumstances in which a prisoner's Sixth Amendment right to counsel is involved, not only must an attorney be given the broadest possible opportunity to meet and confer with his inmate client but the same right as of necessity filters down to his paralegal assistants." 368 F. Supp. at 970. In the second portion of the decision this Court held that the state may not limit attorney access to attorneys of record and directed the state to permit attorneys access to inmates, "in any and all situations serving a legitimate legal or legally related issue which may either directly or indirectly involve that inmate". 368 F. Supp. at 971. Finally, this Court held that the consultation facility for attorneys to meet with their inmates were "of such limited capacity as to infringe on the inmate's right to counsel and court access," *Id.* at 972, and ordered the necessary remedial action.

On appeal the First Circuit affirmed to the extent that the district court opinion is governed by *Procunier* v. *Martinez*, —— U.S. ——, 42 U.S.L.W. 4606 (April 29, 1974).

---

[1] 368 F. Supp. 959.

Costs and Attorneys Fees

Federal courts have equitable powers to award attorneys fees in appropriate cases. *Sprague* v. *Ticonic National Bank*, 307 U.S. 161, 166, 59 S. Ct. 777, 83 L. Ed. 1184 (1939). In the absence of statutory or contractual authorization, the court in its exercise of equitable powers may award attorneys fees and costs when the interest of justice so requires. *Hall* v. *Cole*, 412 U.S. 1, 93 S. Ct. 1943, 36 L.Ed. 2d. 702 (1973); *Mills* v. *Electric Auto-Lite*, 396 U.S. 375, 90 S. Ct. 616, 24 L.Ed. 2d. 593 (1970). Therefore, this Court must decide whether this is an appropriate case for the award of costs and attorneys fees. I conclude that it is.

While the general American rule is that attorneys fees are not ordinarily recoverable as costs, several judicially developed exceptions to this rule have developed. *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.* v. *E.P.A.*, 484 F.2d 1331 (1st Cir. 1973). The First Circuit has recently reiterated its position that in cases where a significant public interest has been forwarded by the suit, the Court may award attorneys fees. *Hoitt* v. *Vitek*, 495 F.2d 219 (1st Cir. 1974). Earlier, in *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.* v. *E.P.A.*, *supra*, the court stated:

> "Recently the notion of spreading the litigation costs equitably among all the beneficiaries has been coupled with that of encouraging suits which promote the public interest. *Newman* v. *Piggie Park Enterprises, Inc.*, 390 U.S. 400, 88 S. Ct. 964, 19 L.Ed.2d. 1263 (1963); *Lee* v. *Southern Home Sites Corp.*, 444 F.2d 143 (5th Cir. 1971); *LaRaza Unida* v. *Volpe*, 57 F.R.D. 94 (N.D. Cal. 1972); *Sims* v. *Amos*, 340 F. Supp. 691 (M.D. Ala. 1972). When private litigation vindicates a significant public policy and at the same time, creates a wide-spread benefit, policy today favors awarding attorneys fees against a party who exists to serve or represent the interest of all those benefitted." 484 F.2d at 1333.[2]

The present case falls clearly within the scope of this exception. The benefit accruing to the plaintiff class from this action cannot be overemphasized. Fundamental rights going to the heart of the integrity of the American system of justice have been vindicated. There can be no question that congressional policies strongly favor the vindication of federal constitutional rights violated under the color of state law, 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Moreover, through experience this Court has learned that often the action of private attorneys willing to devote their time and highly refined skills is absolutely essential for the protection of the constitutional rights of prisoners. The private bar should be encouraged to undertake such difficult and time-consuming litigation. Therefore, an award of attorneys fees to the three private attorneys who represented the plaintiffs in this action is appropriate.[3]

---

[2] Indeed, in *Sims* v. *Amos*, *supra* at p. 694, the proposition was stated even more strongly:

> "In instituting the case sub judice, plaintiffs have served in the capacity of 'private attorneys general' seeking to enforce the rights of the class they represent. (Citations omitted) If, pursuant to this action plaintiffs have benefitted their class and have effectuated a strong congressional policy, they are entitled to attorneys' fees regardless of defendant's good or bad faith. (Citation omitted) Indeed, under such circumstances, the award loses much of its discretionary character and becomes a part of the effective remedy a court should fashion to encourage public-minded suits . . . , and to carry out congressional policy. (Citation omitted)" at p. 694.

[3] The defendant contends that under the Eleventh Amendment to the U. S. Constitution this Court lacks jurisdiction to award attorneys' fees. However, the defendant cites no cases in support of its position. The First Circuit in *Hoitt* v. *Vitek*, *supra*, recently granted attorneys' fees in another 42 U.S.C. sec. 1983 action against the warden of a state prison and in *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.* v. *E.P.A.* the First Circuit took note of the solvent immunity problem and stated:

Left to be determined is the reasonableness of the amount requested by counsel. The fixed costs incurred by Mr. Gonnella and Mr. Stein are undisputed and unchallenged and are therefore granted. As attorneys fees each attorney seeks to be compensated at the rate of $60 per hour and has submitted the affidavit of Mr. Milton Stanzler, a well-known local attorney of recognized stature who is thoroughly familiar with the complexities of civil rights litigation who states that he believes the requested hourly rate is reasonable for litigation of this nature.[4] Accordingly, Attorney Gonnella has submitted an affidavit stating that he expended 189 hours on this case and seeks $11,340 in attorneys fees. Attorney Stein has submitted an affidavit

"[C]ourts have often awarded fees against state agencies or officials. *Ojada* v. *Hackney*, 452 F.2d 947 (5th Cir. 1972); *Taylor* v. *Perini*, 359 F. Supp. 1185 (N.D. Ohio 1973) (civil rights); *LaRaza Unida* v. *Volpe*, 57 F.R.D. 94, 101-102 n. 11 (N.D. Cal. 1972) (environmental protection); *Sims* v. *Amos*, 340 F. Supp. 691, 694 n. 8 (N.D. Ala. 1972) (reapportionment); *NAACP* v. *Allen*, 340 F. Supp. 703, 708, 710 n. 10 (M.D. Ala. 1972) (desegregation)." at pp. 1333-1334.

While one could argue that the Supreme Court's recent Eleventh Amendment decision in *Edelman* v. *Jordan*, 42 U.S.L.W. 4419 (March 25, 1974) concerning a court order directing the state to pay welfare benefits retroactively greatly expands the strength of the Eleventh Amendment, I do not conclude that this decision affects the power of the court to award attorneys' fees. Initially, I note that the First Circuit in *Hoitt* v. *Vitek*, *supra*, issued after the decision in *Edelman*, felt unemcumbered by the Eleventh Amendment in approving the grant of attorneys' fees in a not dissimilar situation. Second, I find the reasoning adopted first in *Sims* v. *Amos*, *supra*, persuasive. The Court wrote:

> "Individuals who, as officers of a state are clothed with some duty with regard to a law of the state which contravenes the constitution of the U. S., may be restrained by injunction and in such a case the state has no power to impart to its officers any immunity from such injunctions or from its consequences including the court costs incident thereto." n. 8.

Therefore, the Court did not find solvent immunity a bar to the award of attorneys' fees. *Taylor* v. *Perini*, *supra*, *LaRaza Unida* v. *Volpe*, *supra*, *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.* v. *E.P.A.*, *supra*.

[4] The counsel for the plaintiff submitted the affidavit of another prominent attorney whose suggested hourly rate was $75.

stating that he spent 29.6 hours on this action and seeks $1,776 in attorneys fees. Finally, Attorney Angelone in his affidavits states that he expended 34 hours on this matter and seeks $2,040 in attorneys fees. The defendant has submitted no affidavits in opposition to the plaintiff's figures but simply argues in his memorandum that a more experienced attorney could have done the work in this case in appreciably less time and that the hourly rate cited is too high for such "young men only recently graduated from law school."

The specific amount of attorneys fees to be granted is within the Court's discretion. *Hoitt* v. *Vitek*, *supra*, 6 *Moore's Federal Practice*, § 54.77 [2], p. 1716. In determining the amount the Court may take into account the circumstances surrounding the case, its importance and complexity, and the skill, experience and professional standards of the attorney.

There is no factual basis in the record that these attorneys are "young men only recently from law school". Their work in this case belies this fact. Their court performance and briefs were of high caliber not to be demeaned because of their age. I found them skilled, well prepared and obviously experienced in prison litigation. The quality and comprehensiveness of their work was of unquestioned assistance to this Court.

The State has not seen fit to question the hours expended by counsel and I, therefore, accept the same as reasonable for this type of litigation. I also accept the undisputed affidavit of Mr. Stanzler and accordingly the fees as requested are hereby granted.

An Order will be prepared accordingly.

By Order

(s) ILLEGIBLE

Clerk

ENTER:

(s) RAYMOND J. PETTINE

Chief Judge

July 8, 1974